

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of this Amendment, Claims 1, 4, 8-18, 35, 36, 38-41, 44 and 45 will be pending in the application.

The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Baxter for the courtesies extended during the May 2, 2006 telephone interview. The Examiner's indication that the "final" status of the November 4, 2005 Office Action has been removed is acknowledged with appreciation.

Independent Claims 1 and 35 have been amended as proposed during the interview to more clearly recite that the base member of the weapon caddy slides and rotates in a substantially horizontal plane. Basis for the amended language is provided in the specification, for example, at page 3, paragraph [0016], Fig. 2, and original dependent Claims 3 and 7. Claims 3 and 7 have been canceled.

Independent Claim 35 has been further amended to recite a single point of connection between the mounting bracket and the base member. Similar language appears in Claim 1. No issue of new matter is presented.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 4, 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Guillen '296. The Guillen '296 patent discloses a book holder with two arms connected together. Although the two arms of the book holder are connected by a thumb screw which allows rotational and sliding movement of one of the arms, there is no teaching or suggestion that the arm slides and rotates in a substantially horizontal plane, as recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 35. Accordingly, Claims 1, 4, 11 and 17 are patentable over Guillen '296.

Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Teague '589. As discussed during the interview, Teague '589 does not disclose a weapon caddy with the combination of a mounting bracket and a base member in which the base member slides and rotates in a substantially horizontal plane as recited in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is patentable over Teague '589.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Jeranek '052. The Jeranek '052 patent also fails to teach or suggest a weapon caddy with the combination of a mounting bracket and a base member as presently claimed in which the

base member slides and rotates in a substantially horizontal plane. Accordingly, Claim 1 is patentable over Jeranek '052.

Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jeranek '052 in view of Hare '169. The Hare '169 patent fails to remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Jeranek '052. Accordingly, Claims 8-10 are patentable over Jeranek '052 and Hare '169.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Teague '589 in view of Griffen '964. The Griffen '964 patent does not remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Teague '589. Accordingly, Claim 12 is patentable over Teague '589 and Griffen '964.

Claims 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Teague '589 in view of Gerdes '654. The Gerdes '654 does not remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Teague '589. Accordingly, Claims 13-16 are patentable thereover.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jeranek '052 in view of Carafice '590. The Carafice '590 does not remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Jeranek '052. Accordingly, Claim 18 is patentable thereover.

Claims 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 44 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Peterson '708. By the present Amendment, independent Claim 35 has been amended to include language similar to that of Claim 1, namely, that the coupling between the mounting bracket and the base member permit both sliding and rotating movement between the mounting bracket and the base member at a single point of connection between the mounting bracket and the base member. Peterson '708 does not teach or suggest such features. Accordingly, Claim 35, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over Peterson '708.

Claim 40 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Peterson '708 in view of Plummer '733. The Plummer '733 patent does not remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Peterson '708. Accordingly, Claim 40 is patentable over Peterson '708 and Plummer '733.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that Claims 1, 4, 8-18, 35, 36, 38-41, 44 and 45 are patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in connection with this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (412) 263-4340 to discuss such matters.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan G. Towner
Registration No. 32,949
Pietragallo, Bosick & Gordon
One Oxford Centre, 38th Floor
301 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Attorney for Applicants

(412) 263-4340